



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

endings in the first act of the *Battle of Alcazar*. In my work on Shakespeare I emphasize always points of dramaturgy rather than those which have received a proportionately fuller consideration from most scholars. This could easily be mistaken for a neglect of crucial data and an undue haste in arriving at conclusions. If these were real instead of seeming faults, Mr. Brooke would have done well in exposing me; but what I have written is accessible, and I lay it not before the modern public which is "pitiably receptive of new theories," but before those who are competent to judge.

HENRY DAVID GRAY.

*Leland Stanford Junior University.*

---

### FIELDING NOTES

#### 1. The Composition of *Pasquin*.

That Fielding's plays were written in haste has been a common assertion of his critics. It is, therefore, rather interesting to discover just how short a time he spent on the composition of *Pasquin*, his famous "Satire on the Times." Presented on Friday, March 5, 1736, it must have been in rehearsal at least as early as Monday, March 1, and yet it contains an allusion to an event which happened as late as February 16.

There are three allusions in all bearing upon the date of composition. The first is in Act I, where Fustian, the author of the tragedy, speaking in defence of his Ghost, says: "I think it is not amiss to remind People of those things which they are, now-a-days, too apt to disbelieve; besides, we have lately had an *Act* against Witches, and I don't question but shortly we shall have one against Ghosts." The act referred to here can be no other than the Witchcraft Bill (9 Geo. II, c. 5), which was read for the first time on January 27, 1736, and which was passed on February 11. This was an act to repeal the act against witchcraft of the first year of James I. It was, in effect, an abolishing of the belief in witches, and thus fits in with the meaning of the text.

The second allusion is in Act II. The third voter says to the colonel: "I have read in a Book call'd *Fog's Journal*, that your Honour's Men are to be made of Wax." This is a reference to an interesting article which appeared in *Fog's Journal* for January 17;

1736, an anonymous letter humorously proposing to create an army of wax-work which would be quite as useful as the real army.

The third allusion is in Act IV, where Law, in speaking of direful omens, says:

The other Day  
A mighty Deluge swam into our Hall,  
As if it meant to wash away the Law:  
Lawyers were forc'd to ride on Porters shoulders;  
One, O Prodigious Omen! tumbled down,  
And he and all his Briefs were sous'd together.

This is most certainly a reference to the high tide of February 16, 1736, which flooded Westminster Hall when the Court of Common Pleas was sitting, an account of which is given in the *Gentleman's Magazine* of February, 1736, and the *Daily Advertiser* of February 17. There is even specific allusion to an accident mentioned in the *Daily Journal*, and quoted in the *Grub-Street Journal* of February 19 as follows: "A porter carrying one of the counsellors thro' the Hall upon his back, the water was so high that he fell down, and they both were like to be drowned."

We thus have allusions to contemporary happenings of January and February, 1736, and if these were seized upon by Fielding while he was writing the play, as I am for several reasons inclined to believe, rather than inserted in a play already written, we have good reason to believe that the first part of *Pasquin*, containing the comedy, was not written until after January 27 at least, and possibly not until after February 11; and that the second part, containing the tragedy, was not written until after February 16, when the rehearsal must have been less than two weeks away. It does not necessarily follow, however, that *Pasquin* was written carelessly.

## 2. Date of *The Historical Register*.

It is customary to refer to *The Historical Register* as having been performed late in March or about the first of April, 1737. Such a statement is based upon the earliest known advertisement, which is found in the *Daily Journal* for Wednesday, April 6. It is in reality only a note to an advertisement of the publication of Lillo's *Fatal Curiosity*, and states that the performance of April 11 would be the ninth day of both *Fatal Curiosity* and *The Historical Register*. It would seem an easy undertaking to reckon back from Monday, April 11, the ninth day, and fix the first performance of

*The Historical Register* for Friday, April 1. There are, however, several objections to such a procedure.

In the first place, the fact that the advertisements printed in the *Daily Journal* of Wednesday, April 6, the *London Daily Post* of Thursday, April 7, and the *Daily Journal* of Friday, April 8, are all for the performance of Monday, April 11, would indicate that there were no performances on Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. These days fell in Passion Week. In the second place, the *Grub-Street Journal* for March 24, 1737, says: "We are informed, that the Tragedy called *The Fatal Curiosity*, now acting in the Hay-Market, and puffed in the Papers as a *New Performance*, was acted there last year, under the Title of *Guilt its own punishment*." This is strong evidence that *The Historical Register*, which was being acted with *Fatal Curiosity*, was being performed as early as March 24, 1737.

Now on just what day was the first performance given? The answer is to be found, I am firmly convinced, in the announcement of Auctioneer Hen in the second act of the play. Hen announces his auction, which is the big scene of the play, as occurring "on Monday, the 21st Day of *March*." Since the twenty-first of March actually fell on a Monday in 1737, and since the first performance cannot be thought of as much earlier than the twenty-fourth, it is a natural assumption that Fielding was here using the actual date of the first performance. It is, at least, a coincidence too striking to be disregarded, and it fits in well with the reference to the plays three days later as "now acting."

### 3. A New Fielding Letter.

In May, 1737, there was printed a controversy which largely concerned the political aspects of Fielding's *Pasquin* and *The Historical Register*. I refer to a vigorous letter signed "An Adventurer in Politicks," which appeared in the *Daily Gazetteer* of May 7, and the vigorous answer to it which appeared in *Common Sense* May 21. This second letter, signed, like the dedication of *Tumble-Down Dick*, by Fielding's pseudonym, "Pasquin," has never been included in any of Fielding's works, but I shall try to show, both by internal evidence and one external source, that it was nevertheless written by Fielding himself.

In the first place it shows Fielding's use of "hath."<sup>1</sup> It is in other respects in the style of Fielding's dedication of *The Historical Register*, and the frank coarseness of the allusion to Ward's Pill, with which the letter concludes, is typical. The use of the first person, while not conclusive of Fielding's authorship, nevertheless helps to strengthen the case in such sentences as, "I shall not be industrious to deny, what you are so good as to declare, that I am buoy'd up by the greatest Wits, and finest Gentlemen of the Age," and "The *Historical Register*, and *Eurydice Hiss'd*, being now publish'd, shall answer for themselves against what you are pleased to say concerning them: but as you are pleased to assert that I have insinuated that all Government is a Farce . . . I shall quote the lines on which you ground your assertions . . . I am far from asserting that all Government is a *Farce*, but I affirm that, however the very Name of Power may frighten the Vulgar, it will never be honoured by the Philosopher, or the Man of Sense, unless accompany'd with Dignity." External corroboration of Fielding's authorship of the letter is not lacking. A letter in *Common Sense* for October 21, 1738, refers to Fielding's use of the analogy of Ward's Pill as follows: "There was a Poet, whose little Pieces became the Delight of the Town, and gave Bread to a Company of Comedians at the little Theatre in the Haymarket: But Wit and Satire, as he himself observed, are like some Medicines, which will not operate upon sound Constitutions, but when they meet with a rotten Carcass, they play the Devil; and our Projector happening to have a great many sore Places about him, our Poet's Pills, gave him the Gripes." This shows that Fielding was at least supposed by a contemporary to be the author of the letter.

The reply which Fielding made to the argument of the "Adventurer in Politicks" against the bringing of politics on the stage was vigorous, and significantly cited Aristophanes as an example. He also defended himself from the assertion that by ridicule he was making light of grave evils, as Gay had turned highwaymen into heroes. He denied that Gay made heroes of his highwaymen, and asserted that "we do not always approve what we laugh at," citing Hobbes to the effect that "Laughter is a Sign of Contempt."

<sup>1</sup> See Keightley, *Fraser's Magazine*, February, 1858, p. 217, and G. E. Jensen's edition of the *Covent-Garden Journal* (Yale Univ. Press, 1915), I, 103.

Incidentally he gives us a glimpse of his idea of satire, which should ridicule without being bitter. "And by raising such a Laugh as this against Vice," he says, "*Horace* assures us we give a sorer Wound, than it receives from all the Abhorrence which can be produced by the gravest and bitterest Satire." It is a sensible and vigorous letter, and under its tone of raillery there is a decided tone of seriousness which points ahead to the Fielding of the *Covent-Garden Journal* and the *Champion*.

CHARLES W. NICHOLS.

*The University of Minnesota.*

---

### REVIEWS

*Karl Gutzkow's Short Stories. A Study in the Technique of Narration.* By DANIEL FREDERICK PASMORE. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company, 1918. 122 pp., \$1.40.

Irgendeine Bibliographie, etwa Herm. Anders Krügers *Deutsches Literatur-Lexikon*, München 1914, enthält so wenig Literatur über Gutzkow, dass man sich wundern muss, warum eine ganze Reihe von Einzeluntersuchungen aus Gutzkows Gebiet nicht längst schon vergeben sind. Die deutsche Forschung behandelt Gutzkow noch immer stiefmütterlich. Houbens ausgedehnte und eindringliche Studien ermöglichen eine bessere Beurteilung von Dichter und Werk, aber selbst Houbens Forschung ist mehr eine umfassender Versuch als ein abschliessendes Werk. Nötige biographische und kritische Vorarbeiten fehlen noch dazu, was bei einem so fruchtbaren Schriftsteller wie Gutzkow doppelt schwer wiegt. Amerikanische Germanisten andererseits beschäftigen sich m. E. immer noch zu einseitig mit der klassischen Literatur des 18. Jahrhunderts und der Frühromantik; das deutsche 19. Jahrhundert endet vielen von ihnen—wie den meisten Professoren des Englischen—mit Heine. Seit einiger Zeit ist ein gewisses Interesse an der modernsten deutschen Literatur wahrzunehmen; aber es steht ohne gründliche wissenschaftliche Erkenntnis gerade der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts auf schwachen Füßen. Es fehlen, wenn ich so sagen darf, die gesunden Bindeglieder zwischen Kuno Franckes wertvoller *History of German Literature* und Ludwig Lewisohns geistreicher Schrift *The Spirit of Modern German Literature*, die eben nach kaum zwei Jahren eine zweite Auflage erlebt hat.